

In the Drawings:

Please replace Figures 3 and 4 with the replacement Figures 3 and 4 submitted herewith.

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claim 15 has been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Applicant has amended Figure 3 to include proper support for the DSPs disclosed in claim 12. No new matter has been added, as the specification properly supports the addition of embedded DSPs within elements 320, 330, 340, 345, and 348 of figure 3. Such support is found in paragraph 0027.

Claims 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant submits that claim 15 has been amended to appear in proper condition for allowance.

Claims 1-3, 5-11 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Diepstraten et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0026198).

Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are patentable over Diepstraten. Specifically, applicant submits that Diepstraten fails to disclose a MAC device monitors an RSSI. Response dated 05/31/05, page 8, para. 2. The Office Action fails to address how such a limitation is anticipated by Diepstraten under 35 U.S.C § 102. Therefore, Applicant restates that Diepstraten fails to disclose, “monitoring a receive signal strength indicator (RSSI) value at the MAC processing element to determine if the data symbols have been completely transmitted from a system transmitter.” In contrast, Diepstraten merely discloses a MAC device possessing a processing means being arranged for detecting a first signal portion and a second signal portion following the first signal portion and having a signal coding differing

from a signal coding of the first signal portion. See Abstract. Such a device is not equivalent to, “monitoring a receive signal strength indicator (RSSI) value at the MAC processing element to determine if the data symbols have been completely transmitted from a system transmitter” , as Diepstraten is completely silent about monitoring an RSSI value at the MAC processing element. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Diepstraten.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and include additional features. Thus, claims 2-5 are also patentable over Diepstraten.

Claim 6 recites a media access layer (MAC) digital signal processor (DSP) to monitor a receive signal strength indicator (RSSI) value to identify that the transmission of all data symbols from the network controller has been completed. For the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 6 is also patentable over Diepstraten. Because claims 7-11 depend from claim 6 and include additional features, claims 7-11 are also patentable over Diepstraten.

Claim 15 recites causing a MAC processing element to monitor a receive signal strength indicator (RSSI) value to determine if the data symbols have been completely transmitted from a system transmitter. Thus, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 15 is also patentable over Diepstraten. Since claims 16-18 depend from claim 15 and include additional features, claims 16-18 are also patentable over Diepstraten.

Claims 4 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Diepstraten in view of Wang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,853). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Diepstraten even in view of Wang.

As stated in the previous response, Wang does not disclose or suggest a MAC DSP to monitor a RSSI value to identify that the transmission of all data symbols from the network

controller has been completed. As discussed above, Diepstraten does not disclose or suggest such a feature. Therefore, any combination of Diepstraten and Wang would also not disclose or suggest the feature. As a result, the present claims are patentable over Diepstraten in view of Wang.

Claims 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Diepstraten in view of McLane et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,309,484). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Diepstraten even in view of McLane.

Applicant respectfully submits that McLane does not disclose a MAC DSP to monitor a RSSI value to identify that the transmission of all data symbols from the network controller has been completed. In contrast, McLane merely discloses that the use of DSPs in general (specifically with ADCs and DACs) allow for a reduction of ICs required to perform signal processing functions. Col. 1, lines 48-53. McLane is completely silent about MAC DSPs monitoring RSSI values. As discussed above, Diepstraten does not disclose or suggest such a feature. Therefore, any combination of Diepstraten and McLane would also not disclose or suggest the feature. As a result, the present claims are patentable over Diepstraten in view of McLane.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.


The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: Oct. 31, 2005



Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980